

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present Amendment, Applicant amends claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35 and 37. Applicant also adds claim 44 to more fully cover various implementations of the invention. Further, Applicant hereby cancels claims 27, 29, 31-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 37 and 44 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claims 23, 30 and 44 being in independent form. Claims 23-37 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has failed to acknowledge Applicant's claim to foreign priority and has not indicated receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document filed July 22, 2004. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the aforementioned claim to foreign priority and acknowledge receipt of the aforementioned Priority Document.

The Examiner has returned the initialed PTO/SB/08 forms filed with the Information Disclosure Statements on July 29, 2003 and May 22, 2007, respectively, indicating that the references cited therein have been considered.

The Examiner has indicated acceptance of the drawing figures filed on July 20, 2003.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 23-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Minari (6,809,831). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the independent reasons stated below.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claims 27, 29, 31-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejections with respect to claims 27, 29, 31-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 are now moot.

Moreover, according to the MPEP, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35, and 37 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Minari.

A. Independent Claim 23

Without conceding the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 23 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite a print control method comprising storing print object data in the server. Claim 23 further recites generating control information for printing the print object data and storing this control information in the server. Moreover, as recited in claim 23, the stored print object data and the control information are requested and transmitted to the print system. That is, according to the invention recited in claim 23, the print object data and the control information are stored in the server and are requested by the print system.

In stark contrast to claim 23, as disclosed in Minari, the PC connected to the printer (which the grounds of rejection allege to correspond to the claimed print system) transmits the print request to the server for requesting the data, and the server, after receiving the print request,

generates the print job object (which the grounds of rejection allege to correspond to the claimed print object data and the claimed control information). *See* FIG. 7 and col. 5, lines 28-40.

Therefore, Minari fails to disclose or suggest storing print object data in the server, storing the control information in the server and requesting the stored print object data and control information by the print system, as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 is not anticipated by Minari for *at least* these reasons. Further, the dependent claims 24-26, 28 and 37 are patentable over Minari *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

B. Independent Claim 30

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 30 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 23 demonstrate the patentability of claim 30. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 30 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Minari reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 33 and 35 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 30. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

IV. New Claims

New claim 44 has been added and is fully supported *at least* by FIG. 1 of the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added. Applicant submits that claim 44 is patentable *at least* by virtue of the recitations set forth therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 13, 2008

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666